UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/870,296	09/870,296 05/30/2001 Tatsushi Nashida		450100-03302	7330
	7590 12/30/200 AWRENCE & HAUG	8	EXAMINER	
745 FIFTH AV	ENUE- 10TH FL.	HOSSAIN, FARZANA E		
NEW YORK, NY 10151			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2424	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/30/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/870,296	NASHIDA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	FARZANA E. HOSSAIN	2424	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 09 December 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidaviral (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ao no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extremely an extra transfer of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of the corresponding a	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	iance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be t	filed within two month	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be They raise new issues that would require further cor 	sideration and/or search (see NO		cause
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belove)	**		
(c) ☑ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or			ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1.2)	16 and 41.33(a)).		
4. 🔲 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	·	•	_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-6,8-11. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 		condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Chain Kallau/			
/Chris Kelley/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2424			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The applicant amended claims 4 and 9 by adding that the recording substitution means obtains advertising information appropriate for user attribute of the requesting origin from another external device by the connection means and the recording substitution means and the b) substitutes said advertising information for the original commercial information included in the recorded program stored in the storage means and replacing advertising content in the recorded program stored in the storage portion with new advertising content received form another external device. Regarding Claim 8, the applicants clarified their claim limitations that the issuing an automatic recording request is in response to the negative output versus issuing the automatic recording substitution request to the external device. These new limitations have to be considered and/or searched.

Claims 4 and 9 were objected to because of the claim language and the specification - the clarification as the applicant amended actually adds new subject matter to the claims that have not yet been rejected in the final rejection because these claims are different from the claims filed 07/23/2008. The examiner also would like to ask the applicant to clarify another external device. The recording center station is the external device that is connected via a wide area network. The claims have a recording substitution means and another external device. Please point to the correct sections that have two external devices to the local storage means for recording when recording advertising information.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding Claims 1-3, the applicant argues that Kuroda does to teach or suggest issuing a recording substitution request in response to a negative result output by the determination means as the user selects a device for the substitution recording (Pagers 9-10).

In response to the argument, the examiner respectfully disagrees. Kuroda's request is performed by the television system to issue a recording substitution request to an external device or that the issued request is based on the determination means of negative result (Figure 7, Figure 22, Column 5, lines 60-65). Also, Kuroda discloses that a program is automatically recorded by being moved to the external device if the local storage device runs out of space (Column 12, lines 16-24). Ellis was not used for this limitation.

Regarding Claim 8, the applicant argues that Kuroda controls the temporary storage device and if the programs overflow then the controller deletes the oldest content from the storage device (Pages 13-14). The applicant aruse that Lawler does not teach issuing a recording substitution request in response to negative result from a determination portion (Page 14).

In response to the argument, the claim limitation requires there to be a request to record a program on local storage means and if it is determined that space is insufficient to automatically issue a recording request to an external device and Kuroda discloses that a program is recorded and there is not enough space then the program is moved to the external device if the local storage device runs out of space (Column 12, lines 16-24). Lawler discloses automatically issuing a recording request to the external storage device for recording the program via the wide network by the connection means (Column 13, lines 8-12, 26-36). The examiner would also like to point out the applicant has added commas which the examiner is interpreting as to clarify that the recording substitution request is made in response to negative result versus the previous limitation that the recording substitution request was automatically issued to the external storage device and that the clarification is changing the scope of the claim limitation enough to require further consideration and/or search.